

**PSP Comments on the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community's Non-Point Pollution Public Information and Education Initiative – Year 3**  
6/6/2013

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community's proposal for Year 3 of the *Non-Point Pollution Public Information and Education Initiative*. This project has an ambitious scope with limited resources. In general, our comments focus on the potential to do something more limited in scope that would have a potentially greater impact under this grant. Many of our comments address themes and details similar to those identified by the EPA.

1. We recognize that this program was framed since year one as a Washington State-wide initiative. Given limited time and resources, would it make more sense to concentrate on Puget Sound or certain Puget Sound counties, specifically? This may allow the applicant to better target these limited resources for measurable results. For instance, we note that the sample size of the survey conducted in July 2012 (pg. 4) may not allow one to tease out differences among different regions of the state. If the interest and funding is direct towards Puget Sound, are there opportunities to be more focused in the work? If the applicant believes a statewide approach is necessary, are there other groups that the applicant could work with to expand a common approach across the state? For instance, other tribes?
2. In general, the budget does not seem large enough for enough repetition, number of impressions, and an appropriate length of run for the print and radio media (noted on pgs 5 & 6) to produce measurable result. The budget will not support sufficient television advertising. Given past staff experience, a skilled consultant (media buyer) can be helpful in determining the most effective media approach for a given amount of resources. Perhaps this is covered in the "professional services" budget? In general, it would be helpful to have more detail under this budget category (and associated tasks) to know what exactly what services are being supported.
3. The focus group methodology (pg. 6) may need revising. We recommend doubling the number of focus groups for best results. If the applicant would like a comparison with Eastern Washington, one focus group will not answer the question.
4. In general, how will results from surveys gathered in this timeframe be attributed to this education and outreach initiative and be distinguished from all other programs around the state (as described on pg. 5)?
5. We recommend that stakeholders and decision makers (mentioned on pg. 4) be thought of as different groups and those groups be addressed differently. As an example, the PSP has focused specifically on landowner support as an

effective approach, which is why the PSP is investing in social marketing efforts.

6. Please describe in more detail the "water quality partners" mentioned under "Material development and dissemination" (pg. 5). Who are these partners? Stormwater municipalities? NGOs? Other Tribes?
7. The Public Awareness & Engagement plan of 2006 cited in this proposal (pg. 3) is obsolete. We recommend referring to strategies developed since that time, specifically the Puget Sound Starts Here campaign as described in the Puget Sound Action Agenda.
8. The approach mentions the Applicant's intent to "Contact/communicate with PSP regarding post-2006 education and outreach surveys and messaging, for potential coordination and data sharing" (pg. 3). We greatly appreciate this effort. The PSP has gathered significant amounts of material since 2006 that may be helpful to this project.

We appreciate the time and energy the applicant is putting into this ambitious initiative. If the applicant is interested, we are happy to sit down to talk through the methodologies and lend what experience we may have towards strengthening this proposal.

All the Best,  
Scott